DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 034 JC 740 475

AUTHOR Gold, Ben K.

TITLE A Comparative Analysis of Performance on the 1973-1974 ARRT X-Ray Technology Examinations.

Research Study No. 74-9.

INSTITUTION Los Angeles City Coll., Calif.

PUB DATE NOV 74
NOTE 10p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Comparative Analysis; Higher

Education; Post Secondary Education; *Radiologic Technologists; Statistical Data; Tables (Data); Technical Education; *Test Results; Universities

IDENTIFIERS American Registry of Radiologic Technologists:

California: *Los Angeles City College

ARS TRACT

Some comparative statistics are provided on the performance of Los Angeles City College (LACC) students on the 1973-74 examinations in X-Ray Technology given by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT). The data from the ARRT report are presented in five tables, as follows: (1) an overall summary: (2) California community colleges; (3) California institutions other than community colleges; (4) performance by state, all institutions; and (5) performance by state, community colleges only. The study data showed that: (1) the 29 LACC candidates were the 11th largest group of all 1,030 institutions in the U.S., 7th largest of the 99 U.S. community colleges, and 2nd largest of the 20 California community colleges; (2) 18 percent of the candidates are from community colleges, and in California, over half of the candidates are from community colleges; (3) community colleges averaged 14 candidates per institution (18 in California); other institutions averaged 7 candidates; (4) when compared with other California community colleges, LACC performance was slightly better in failure rate (7 percent compared with 9 percent) and slightly poorer in average scaled score (83.0 compared with 84.0); (5) California community college candidates performed better than their counterparts nationwide in both failure rate and average scaled score; and (6) when compared with other California institutions, California community colleges performance was about equivalent: failure rate was slightly poorer; and average scaled score was slightly better. (DB)



. pr. 2.

EU COSOS

Company the Entire medical Miles of Company and Compan

BEST COLL TO THE

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE

"A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE ON THE 1973-1974 ARRT X-RAY TECHNOLOGY EXAMINATIONS"

Research Study #74-9

Ben K. Gold Research Office November, 1974



JC 140 415

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE ON THE 1973-1974 ARRT X-RAY TECHNOLOGY EXAMINATIONS"

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study was undertaken at the request of Yiss Gertrude Pearson, Chairman of the Los Angeles City College Radiologic Technology Department, to provide some comparative statistics on the performance of IACC students on the 1973-1974 examinations in X-Ray Technology, given by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT).

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

Miss Pearson furnished to the Research Office a 24 page booklet listing by state and by institution a summary of performance of candidates taking either the November, 1973 or May, 1974 ARRT examination for the first time. For each of the 1,030 institutions the report indicated the number tested, number failed, percent failed and average scaled score for the candidates from that institution. These listings provide the lata for the tables of the nest section.

FINDINGS

The data from the ARRT report are presented in five tables, as follows:

(1) an overall summary; (2) California Community Colleges; (3) California institutions other than Community Colleges; (4) performance by State, all institutions; and (5) performance by State, Community Colleges only. Average scaled score is a weighted average for the institutions indicated, and has been figured for all Community Colleges and for other institutions within California. Totals differ slightly (less than one half of one percent) from those available in the report.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Page 2.

TABLF 1 - Summary of Performance on ARRT X-Ray Technology Examinations (November, 1973 and May, 1974)

	No. of Institutions	No. Tested	No. Failed	% Failed	Average Scaled Score	Average No tested per Institution
Total United	States					
	1030	8009	1086	13.6%	N/A	7.8
Community Colleges	99	1420	213	15.0%	82.0	14.3
Hospitals and Universities	931	6589	873	13.27.	n/a	7.1
Total Califo	rnia 59	641	59	9.2%	84.0	10.9
Community Colleges	20	366	33	9.0%	84.0	18.3
Hospitals and Universities	39	275	26	9.5%	83.9	7.1
Los Angeles City College	1	29	2	6.9%	83.0	29.0

TABLE 2 - Performance on ARRT K-Ray Technology Examinations (November, 1973 and May, 1974): California Community Colleges

	College	No. Tested	No. Failed	% Failed	Average Standard Score
	Fullerton Junior				
•	College	32	5	16	83
)	Los Angeles City	-			
• •	College	29	2	7	83
3.	Merritt		_		
J.	College	29	0	ט	86
<i>1</i> .	San Francisco City	~ /	, and the second		
4.	-	28	3	11	$\mathfrak{s},$
c	College				
5.	Fresno City	24	3	13	83
,	College				
6.	Long Beach City	24	2	8	82
_	College	24			0-
7.	Chaffey	23	4	17	84
_	College	23	-	1 *′	0.4
8.	Orange Coast	00	2	9	84
_	College	23	2	,	5-4
9.	San Diego Mesa	0.5	1	5	83
_	College	21	1	, ,	63
.0,	Yuba		4	24	82
	College	17	4	2.4	ij 2
1.	•			0	85
_	College	16	0	U	65
12.	Mt. San Antonio				89
	Collage	15	0	0	0.9
13.	Foothill				86
	College	14	0	0	00
14.	Bakersfield			1 _	0,4
	College	13	1	7	86
L5.	Santa Rosa Junior				00
•	College	13	3	23	82
16.	Merced	_			
	College	12	3	25	79
17.	Canada	1	_		
	College	11	0	0	88
18.	El Camino	1		1	1
	College	11	0	0	88
9.	Cabrillo				
	College	6	0	0	87
20.	Antelope Valley				
-	College	5	0	0	86
~	TOTAL	366	33	9.0%	84.0

TABLE 3 - Performance on ARRT X-Ray Technology Examinations (November 1973 & May 1974): California Hospitals, Universities, and Frivate Colleges

		No. Tested	No. failed	7 Failed	Average Standard Score
1.	Loma Linda University	20	1 4 100	5	83
2.			•		03
~ •	Wadsworth Hospital	16	1	6	84
3.	-		•		5 -4
٠.	Hospital	16	0	0	88
4.		16	4	25	81
5.		20	-		
7.	General Hospital	14	6	43	77
6.			•	, i	• •
٠.	General Hospital	12	1	8	82
7	Stanford University		-	_	
<i>,</i> •	Hospital	12	0	0	85
Q	U. S. Naval Hospital		· ·		
٠.	San Diego	12	3	25	79
٥	Children's Hospital IA	10	ĭ	10	87
	Santa Monica Hospital	10	ī	10	82
	San Joaquin General		•		
	Hospital, Stockton	9	0	0	91
12	University of California		•	Ĭ	
A-6- 6	San Francisco	8	0	o	89
13.			•		
13.	Hospital, Inglewood	7	0	0	84
14.		′ 1	·		
***	Sacramento	7	1	14	85
15.		′ 1	•		
1.7.	Lymwood	7	0	0	85
16.		′	J		
	Los Angeles	6	1	17	86
17.	Huntington Memorial	_	-		
-/-	Hospital, Pasadena	6	0	0	90
18.					
,	San Jose	6	0	0	87
19.		_	•		
	Burbank	6	0	0	88
20.		· 1	_		
	Center San Jose	6	0	0	86
21.		al			
	Oakland	5	1	20	80
22.	·	cal			
	Center Burlingame	5	0	0	88
23.				}	
	Oxnard	5	1	20	78
24.					τ }
	Medical Center	5	0	0	85
			_	<u> </u>	

(continued on next page)



TABLE 3 (continued)

		No. Tested	No. Failed	7. Failed	Agerage Standard Score
25.	Sutter Community				
	Hospital Sagramento	5	0	0	91
26.	U. S. Naval Hospital		_		
•	Oakland	5	2	40	74
27.	University Hospital				
	San Diego	5	O	0	88
28.	California Hospital				
-	Medical Center, LA	4	0		84
29.	Contra Costa County				
	Hospital, Mirtinez	4	0	0	81
30.	Memorial Hospital	- -			-
	Exeter	4	0	0	83
31.	Riverside Community	·			
	Hospital	4	0	0	83
32.		•			
,	Santa Monica	4	0	1 0 1	90
33.		·		-	
	Hospital	4	0	0	87
34.	•	•			•
	Health Serv. Center L		0	0	88
35.		•			•
•••	Bureka	2	0	0	83
36.	Hawthorne Community	_			
	College Hawthorne	2	1	1 1	50
37.	Sacra Memorial Hosp.	_	_		
	Sun Valley	1	0	0	75
38.	South Coast Community	_			, -
	Hospital S. Laguna	1	0	0	90
39_	U.S. Naval Hospital	_			
	Camp Pendleten	1	1	100	70
	TOTAL	275	26	9.5%	83.9



(continued on next page)

TABLE 4 - Ferformance on ARET X-Ray Technology Examinations (November 1973 & May 1974): by State, All Institutions

																		(BE	51	U	U۲	I	AY	RH	LA.	2	L					F
per Institution	8.5	4.8	י מ	7.0	6.0	1.5.1	10.6	0.8	5,2	7.9	on :	N (κή (κή (E	20.6	0 ·	3 V	ח מ) e	٠	ז ת	P) · · ·	7.0	•	30 I	· · ·	0.0	m ∙	pref (8	3.2	8.7
Failed	7	¥ 1.	2 6	O. C.	9.2	12.7	13.6	12.5	42.3	11.7	16.1	18.2	0.0	•	•		•	0.11	5.5	4 6	19.2	0	14.0	o (18.0	13.3	7.1	•	ه	•	•	26.3	•
Pailed	æ	- A1	٠.	7	φς	A	53	7		25	56	~	I	88	T	<u> </u>	٠٠. ا	E 8	77	7)	0 9	91	X	3	× ;	26	~	<u>ب</u>	~	4	٠ <u>٠</u>	2	20
Rank	26	2 6	9 (33	 1	54	11	84	42	12	16	49	45	•	22	22	27	25	77	67	51	30		20	37	14	41	35	43	39	σ	97	'n
Tested		717	2	57	3	118	213	16	56	213	081	7.7	20	450	191	123	16	112	142	*	208	310	372	156	6 3	196	28	\$	25	33	302	19	487
Renk	26	9 6	32	38	*	29	51	7.7	3	77	33	847	07	m	22	16	72	52	70 70	30	25 27	~	∞	01	33	17	41	ສ	97	35	0	42	'n
No. of	1200	3,	90	9	59	6	20	7	יאו	27	56	7	9	62	ro ;;4	22	17	17	19	6	21	13	37	30	∞	22	9	80	8	00	37	9	26
	7.6	na.	and and		California	rado	Consectiont	Colemna	Matrict of Columbia		Georgia		Q	Illinois	:-dlana	65	Kansas	Kentucky	Louistana	ne	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Vebraska	Vevada	Hampshire			York
4 6	State	Alabama	Arizona	Arkenses	Calt	Colorado			Mat	710	9	Hawa 11	Idaho	111	P	Love	Kan	Ken	Ž	Maine	Mar	Mas	Mic	Min	24. M18		• •		Nev	Nev	Nev	Nec	N N



TABLE 4 (centimed)

		No. of		No.		Zo.		•
	State	Insts.	Rank	Tested	Rank	Failed	Pailed	
33.	North Carolina	92	71	179	17	32	17.9	љ. У
*	North Dakota	80	36	32	40	٧.	15.6	0.4
35.	Ohio	26	7	511	4	: 1	13.9	9
36.	Oklahoma	16	28	62	32	10	16.1	6.2
37.	Oregan	4	45	69	30	8	4.3	17.2
38,	Pennsylvania	87	~	280	7	105	17.8	8.9
39.	Rhode Island	6	31	42	36	'n	11.9	4.7
40.	South Carolina	11	27	78	28	10	12.8	7.1
41.	South Dakota	∞	37	5 2	3	5	20.8	3,0
42.	Tennesee	18	23	159	18	17	10.7	æ. æ
43	Техав	52	9	563	e	66	•	10.8
\$	Utah	9	43	51	z	m	6.5	-
45.	Vermont	2	69	17	47	0	0.0	8.8
46.	Virginia	77	33	157	19	21	13.4	9
47.	Washington	œ	38	63	31	~	3.2	7.9
48	West Virginia	19	21	123	23	2g	22.8	5°9
649	Wisconsin	30	11	226	10	9	2.7	7.5
50.	Wyoming	2	50	œ	20	m	37.5	0.4
; ; ;	TOTALS	1030	6 8 8 8 8 8	6008	1 6 8 8 8 9 9 9	1086	13.6	7.8
						†		

IABLE 5 - Perference on ARRI X-Ray Technology Examinations (November 1973 & May 1974): By State, Community Colleges Only

-								Aver.	Aver. No.
		No. of		•		ZO.	н	Scaled	Tested
		_	Remk	Testad	Remk	Pailed	Pailed	Score	per College
-	Alchem		11	×	15		12.5	81.9	12.0
	Artzena	8	22	\$	17	6	21.4	78.9	7.0
•	Calt Cornte	20	-	366		8	0.0	0.78	18.3
· •6	Colorado	} •	20	2	-	10	17.9	81.0	56.0
	Compost Cat	4	49	63	φ	0,	15.9	82.4	15.8
, v	Plontide	2	ย	31	ដ	60	9.7	84.3	15.5
,	Marcal		21	00	20	7	25.0	80.0	3.0
- cc	Titods	12	7	3	4	33	22.4	81.4	11.2
6	Kancas	7	7	77	18	~-	8.3	81.2	6.0
10.	Matne	prod	22	•	21	0	0.0	25.0	0.8
	Maryland	· m	00	39	10	ĸ	12.8	83.6	13.0
12	Measachusacts	0	m	187	8	1.9	10.2	81.6	20.8
5	The feet of	~	23	*	27	0	0.0	78.0	6.0
12	X. and	~	15	27	77	က	11.1	76.0	13.5
,	Mecodo		26	^	23	0	0.0	83.0	7.0
2	New Jersey	ı en	6	26	60	24	42.9	76.5	
7	New York	65	4	142	en en	35	24.6	80.2	15.8
K K	Worth Carolina	-	25	œ	22	m	37.5	0.9/	0.8
5	Obto	m	10	88	11	s.	13.2	81.3	12.7
20.	Oklahoma		56	ຕ	28	F4	33,3	77.0	3.0
21.	Oregon	7	16	3	Ŋ	8	3.1	92.6	32.0
22	South Carolina	2	17	2	16	7	13.3	86.5	7.5
23.	South Daiota	7	18	7	22	m	42.9	79.1	3.5
24.	Tennessee	7	19	6	13	0	0.0	82.0	4.5
25	Texas	1	Ŋ	33	12	^	18.4	81.5	7.0
26.	Washington	4	^	47	o,	~	42.6	9.48	22°
27.	West Virginia	gund	27	9	92	4	2.99	71.0	ට .
28.	Wyoming	prof.	28	_	25	m	42.9	78.0	7.0
\$ # F		00	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	14.20		213	15.0%	82.0	14.3
	IUIALS	2.2		≯ € 1			PI I	• 1	
The state of the s									

CONCLUSIONS

Following are some observations on the findings:

- (1) The 29 candidates from L.A.C.C. represented the eleventh largest total of all of the 1,030 institutions in the U.S., the seventh largest total of the 99 U.S. Community Colleges, and the second largest total of 20 California Community Colleges.
- (2) About 10% of U.S. institutions sending candidates are Community Colleges, but about 18% of the candidates are from Community Colleges. In California, about a third of the institutions are Community Colleges, but over half of the candidates are from Community Colleges.
- (3) Community Colleges averaged 14 candidates per institution (18 in California); other institutions averaged 7 candidates per institution.
- (4) When compared with other California Community Colleges, L.A.C.C. performance was slightly better in failure rate (7% compared with 9%) and slightly poorer in average scaled score (83.0 compared with 84.0). Differences are not statistically significant.
- (5) California Community College candidates performed better than their counterparts nationwide in both failure rate (9% compared with 15%) and in average scaled score (84.0 compared with 82.0).
- (6) When compared with other California institutions (almost all hospitals and/or medical centers), California Community Colleges' performance was about equivalent; failure rate was slightly poorer (9.5% to 9.0%), average scaled score was slightly better (84.0 to 83.9).

* * * * * * * * * * * *

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

CLEARINCHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INF YMATION

